

**MANHEIM TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
Wednesday
November 12, 2008**

A special meeting of the Manheim Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, November 12, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. for the presentation of the draft Comprehensive Plan. The following planning commission members were present: Mr. Jeffrey Sturla; Mr. Michel Gibeault; Mr. Robert Wolf; Mr. Cory Rathman; Mr. Donald Reed; Mrs. Mary Ellen Hollinger and Mr. Michael Martin.

The following Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee members were present: Mr. Michael Fessler; Mr. Michael Keene; Mr. Steve Geisenberger; Mr. Patrick Trimble; Mr. William Murry; Mrs. Kathleen Potier and Mr. Timothy Kauffman. Mrs. Carol Simpson; Mr. John Eby and Ms. Debra Desha were absent.

Steering Committee Township Staff members present were Mr. Sean Molchany; Mrs. Lisa Douglas and Mrs. Shannon Sinopoli.

There were 41 patrons in the audience.

Mr. Sturla called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and conducted roll call.

Mr. Sturla informed the audience that this special meeting is being held to present the Draft Comprehensive Plan to the Planning Commission and that this is the first presentation that the Planning Commission will hear.

Mr. Sturla informed the audience that Mr. Timothy Staub and Mr. Steven Gabriel, representatives of Rettew Associates, will be outlining the draft Comprehensive plan via a Power Point presentation which will last approximately thirty (30) minutes. Mr. Sturla advised that, at the end of the presentation, the planning members will make comments and ask questions first and then comments and questions from audience members will be received.

Mr. Staub conducted the Power Point Presentation summarizing the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Staub discussed the process and progress of the plan over the past year and a half, the implementation of strategies used and the Steering Committee's involvement throughout the process.

Mr. Staub indicated that the Steering Committee held four listening sessions over the past year where approximately one hundred (100) residents attended.

Mr. Staub indicated that a survey was also sent out to every household and approximately twenty-one percent (21%) responded back, with approximately eighty percent (80%) responding that they thought the quality of life was really good in the community.

Mr. Staub advised that some of the ideas encouraged small unique local businesses as opposed to larger commercial establishments and to look more at the connectivity of the trails and sidewalk network within the community as well as to provide for mixed housing types with various price ranges.

Mr. Staub continued with the PowerPoint presentation by briefing discussing each section of the draft plan.

MOBILITY SECTION

Mr. Staub indicated that transportation received the lowest scores when they went out and talked to the people, as well as based on the survey responses, regarding the level and conditions of congestion.

Mr. Staub advised that the primary solutions that were looked at was the existing infrastructure and to consider upgrading the existing roadways instead of creating new roads as well as to adjusting traffic signals to try and avoid some congestion issues and idling at traffic lights.

Mr. Staub stated that forty-eight percent (48%) of traffic in the community is associated with pass-thru traffic due to the several main corridors that go through Manheim Township and that this traffic will only continue to escalate.

Mr. Staub indicated that the committee looked at ways to introduce other transportation modes to reduce the dependence on the automobile; such as mass transit and non-motorized path connections for bike riding. These alternative modes should be considered now more than ever and transit facilities in the community could be enhanced to be used more often.

LAND USE SECTION

Mr. Staub indicated that sixty-one percent (61%) of the survey responses encouraged neighborhood commercial enterprises as well as eighty-three percent (83%) encouraged spending Township tax dollars for Agricultural Preservation.

Mr. Staub advised that the steering committee held discussions regarding growth management, preferred development styles and mixing up housing types, as well as redevelopment.

Mr. Staub indicated that the northeastern portion of the Township is the Agricultural District, which under existing Zoning Regulations and methodology, the agricultural community should continue as such over the next 10-20 years and in the future.

Mr. Staub indicated that the Residential Classifications were broken down into two (2) large categories; a Low to Medium Residential Classification (which primarily occurs in areas above Route 30) and a Medium to High Residential Classification (which is primarily occurs south of Route 30).

Mr. Staub advised that the Commercial Designations are clumped into two classifications; one is an Office/Local Commercial and the other, a Corridor Interchange classification, with the main difference between these two commercial types being based on the traffic generation.

Mr. Staub indicated that the Industrial Classification is located around the Airport which is where manufacturing wholesale and office uses would continue.

Mr. Staub indicated that there are three (3) special purpose districts;

- 1) An Urban Transitional Classification where there is a lot of potential for redevelopment of the areas adjacent to the city which have a different feel than the rest of the Township outside of this area.
- 2) A Village Classification. There are two areas classified as Village, with one area in Neffsville and one in Oregon. Both of these areas are viewed as being unique places in the Township which would have some mixing of local commercial and more of a walkable community as Neffsville was historically and to try maintaining existing architecture.
- 3) A Campus Classification which would consist of the areas of the Lancaster Bible College and the Lancaster Airport.

DENSITY

Mr. Staub indicated that the Low to Medium Densities are being based on 0-4 dwelling units per acre and allowing up to 7 units per acre when utilizing TDRs (Transferrable Development Rights).

Mr. Staub indicated that the Medium to High Densities are being based on 0-8 dwelling units per acre and allowing up to 12 units per acre when utilizing TDRs.

Mr. Staub stated that the density goal in the Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan is 7-1/2 units per acre within an urban growth area (which encompasses all of Manheim Township).

Mr. Staub provided some examples of existing development densities throughout Manheim Township:

- 1) Landis Valley Homes - 1.3 dwelling units per acre
- 2) Stonehenge - .45 dwelling units per acre
- 3) Brighton - 2.7 dwelling units per acre
- 4) Kissel Hill Commons - 4.1 dwelling units per acre
- 5) Glenmoore Circle - 3.5 dwelling units per acre
- 6) Golden Triangle Apartments - 6.8 dwelling units per acre
- 7) Grandview Heights - ranges from 3.7 to 6.5 dwelling units per acre
- 8) Brethren Village - 6 to 12 dwelling units per acre

HOUSING

Mr. Staub indicated that the housing goal is to expand housing options to meet the needs of the changing population and to maintain existing developments and to mix in commercial uses.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Staub advised that Infrastructure received good reviews from the community and were encouraged to make sure that for any new developments; the road improvements are in place before any occupancy certificates are approved. The plan also calls for the partnering with the school district for park and recreational use and services.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Staub indicated that this plan promotes Agricultural Preservation and the introduction of green infrastructure as goals.

Mr. Staub concluded the PowerPoint presentation and outlined the process for the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan by indicating that this meeting was the first presentation and that there will be additional upcoming meetings for additional comment and questions.

Mr. Staub indicated that during this time frame of additional meetings, the draft plan will be forwarded to the Lancaster County Planning Commission, the adjacent municipalities and the Manheim Township School District for their reviews and comments.

Mr. Staub advised that the public also has the opportunity for reviewing and commenting on the draft plan, whether it's in writing or during a public meeting.

Mr. Staub indicated that once all of the comments are taken into consideration by the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission will have to officially act by making recommendations to the Board of Commissioners for consideration during the public hearing.

Mr. Staub advised that the draft plan is viewable on the Township's website and that a hard copy is also available for viewing at the Township. Mr. Staub indicated that draft plans and/or CD's may also be purchased through the Township.

Mr. Sturla thanked Mr. Staub and asked for comments or questions from the Planning Commission members.

Mr. Reed stated the following:

1) Mr. Reed stated he was questioning the use of TDRs and that we are going from 1.75 units per acre in the R-1 District and with a TDR you can go to 2.3 units. Now we are starting with 4 units per acre by right without a TDR and going up to 7 units with a TDR, so, we are doubling the amount of units permitted by right per acre before you start with any TDRs. Is this really a sound approach? We preserved less than 200 acres to date over a period of 15 years and we have 2000 acres to preserve.

2) Mr. Reed stated that he would like to look at Grandview Heights which was pointed out as being the model community. There is a property adjoining Grandview Heights called the Gammache property and what is proposed here is that this property would become Medium to High density which means you could have 8 units per acre without a TDR or 12 units with the use of TDRs on that property. There is a proposal before the Planning Commission at the moment that in fact a developer wants to rezone this property to R-3 currently. That would allow 100% apartments or townhouses or 100% duplexes, does that continue the style of Grandview Heights which is a concern.

Mr. Reed stated that he would like to look at School Lane Hills and said there is a property called Baker Field, owned by F&M, and currently zoned R-2, which is currently 2.3 units per acre. This map shows that this area would become Medium to High which means 8-12 units, which ruins the style of School Lane Hills.

Mr. Reed referred to the Reist and Stoner Farms and stated, what is shown is that a road would actually run from Winchester Drive to Country Club Drive and it would bisect through those two properties. So, my question is how we communicate with those property owners that this is a future proposal and how do we tell people that might want to buy in that area that this is something that is shown as a possible road improvement in Manheim Township.

3) Mr. Reed stated that he looked at the meeting minutes of the steering committee and it was mentioned at both the March and the April meeting that first Infrastructure improvements are necessary and then the density improvements would be discussed. I don't see that here. I see that what we are going with Density improvement first, but what I want to know is what the infrastructure improvements will be before we get to the point of density increases.

4) Mr. Reed stated that he was questioning the bus transportation routes and the new route proposed which would go down Glenmoore Circle, but why there would be no bus stop at the Golden Triangle which doesn't make sense to him because we want to move people in and out of shopping centers.

Mr. Staub gave the following responses:

Comment #1 – Mr. Staub stated that right now there are not a lot of developers out there using the TDR program, so we wanted to put an incentive in there for the developers to consider and the other thing is that the trade off there is, while you are getting some density uptakes, you are having opportunity to preserve those lands in the future, where right now there is only 500 acres preserved and there are 2000 acres out there that need to be preserved and without asking the entire community to put an Ag Preserve Bond out there and asking them to pay for more for this preservation, the committee thought that this was an incentive to possibly kick start the Agricultural Preservation program.

Comment #2 – Mr. Staub stated that in response to Grandview Heights and School Lane Hills going from 8-12 units/acre; Grandview is currently at 6.5 units per acre and there are recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan that is different from what is currently on the Township's books right now for the residential classifications. The mixing of those residential capacities within those communities is something that we think Manheim Township needs to

go back to.....where there is a mix of housing units with mixed architectural and better communities versus the cookie cutter style developments.

Mr. Molchany stated that under today's Zoning Ordinance, you couldn't build Grandview Heights and it doesn't have to be between 8-12 units, it could be between 0-12 units, so someone could still build a one unit per acre. Mr. Molchany stated that to clarify, this document is a policy document only and that the classifications of low to medium and medium to high densities does not change the current zoning classification, there will still be R1, R2 and R3 Zoning Districts, this plan does not change zoning.

In response to the Reist and Stoner Farms, Mr. Staub stated that the Steering Committee members indicated to us that there is no way, in this planning period, that those two property owners are going to change their mindset of being agricultural farmers and it would be very unlikely that they would sell the farms and develop, however, Manheim Township doesn't have much remaining land and we are trying to take the few opportunities that we have and say, from here to here it makes sense to have a connector road.

Comment #3 – Mr. Staub stated that the committee can tell you that density and infrastructure was an on-going discussion as to whether or not we have the right amount of transportation improvements put in place to support the density and the numbers were worked and the Township's Capital Improvements plan for transportation was looked at.

Comment #4 – Mr. Staub indicated that existing bus routes are not shown on this plan, only the ones proposed, therefore, the existing stops will remain, such as the one at Golden Triangle Shopping Center.

Mr. Reed questioned the increase in building height by encouraging up to 5 stories.

Mr. Staub indicated the steering committee felt that building up was better than building out to try and save land.

Mr. Geisenberger and Mr. Gabriel responded but were inaudible.

Mr. Sturla questioned future trends with this plan for the next 20 years and asked if it is best practices to use the survey of what the existing people believe as the basis for all the planning for the next 20 years or did we use other model communities used to benchmark this as to best practices.

Mr. Sturla stated that it sounds to him like, the response to more density, is in response to our TDR program which is a bad answer, a good answer would be that it's a model trend not a response to an old problem.

Mr. Staub indicated that public feedback was viable, but the steering committee also brought in best practices and documents of visualizing density from around the country and what those developments would look like with walking trails, green infrastructure, green roofing, mixed communities.

Steering committee members spoke, but were inaudible.

Mr. Rathman asked, in regards to the Mobility Section, specifically the traffic, there was talk about the three improvements that the residents believe to be made the most, however, is the Steering Committee also putting forth their recommendations as well and do they incorporate PADOT's recent documents that actually gets away from widening the roads and uses more interconnectness through existing neighborhoods as well as the traffic volumes on Harrisburg Pike that were studied and was wondering if these documents have been incorporated into the Steering Committee's discussions and how do they see those new PADOT guidelines.

Mr. Staub indicated that they have incorporated the Harrisburg Pike study and that their suggestions have been placed in this document as well as the majority of the 1998 Capital Improvements plan as to what has been done so far. Mr. Staub indicated that yes, we also considered the Smart Transportation booklet from PADOT, however, a lot of those concepts are in planning right now.

Mr. Staub indicated that discussions of right-of-ways and cross sections that include bike lanes and pedestrian lanes, traffic calming, etc. also took place.

Mr. Gibeault asked if there were other uses or other ways that were looked at by the group to utilize TDRs other than simply increasing density.

Mr. Molchany indicated that there are no specific alternatives listed in the Comprehensive Plan, however, the township staff has been looking at other alternatives that were shared with the committee to utilize TDRs through building size, building height and a few other avenues that have been looked at in trying to implement.

Mr. Geisenberger spoke but was inaudible.

Mr. Martin commended the Steering Committee for the detailed study of the streets and believes that as the Township moves forward with future developments one of the biggest changes, in the look of the community, is the streetscapes that are being proposed in this plan and the ability to manage pedestrians and parking and bikes in a safe way and in an aesthetically pleasing way, he thinks will go along way.

Mr. Martin encouraged maintaining the Township as a model community and continue to promote best practices even going to the point where some of the incentives or requirements for development tie to levels of certification such as green building design.

Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Murry spoke but were inaudible.

Mr. Sturla asked for public comment or questions from the audience and for participants to come up to the microphone and state their name(s) and address(s).

Public Comment

1. Patron; Jeff Ross, Newton Road Resident

Mr. Ross stated that that he lives in the School Lane Hills development which is a

beautiful model neighborhood. Mr. Ross stated that he is a member of the board of the School Lane Hills Neighborhood association and was here on behalf of a number of residents.

Mr. Ross stated that this neighborhood encompasses more than just Manheim Township. It encompasses portions of Manheim Township, Lancaster Township and Lancaster City and is composed of primarily single family dwellings on tree lined streets that are quiet and primarily devoid of cut thru traffic. It's a high value neighborhood and people seek it out from all other the county.

Mr. Ross stated that a lot of people came tonight because when they saw this map would increase the housing density in that area to a possibility of 8 units per acre, which is an incredibly high increase over the existing neighborhood, so if that becomes the zoning code then rebuilding in that neighborhood could instantaneously transform it to an area filled with apartments across the street from single family houses and dramatically change the neighborhood.

Mr. Ross stated that increasing the density of the rest of the area now owned by F&M, known as the Brickyard, is low density housing area, this map would change it to 8 units per acre up to 12 if there was some sort of exchange of TDRs, but still the fact that this would be a development by right.

Mr. Ross stated that he thinks that there would be interest in developing that area into that density of housing, and if that happens, Wilson Drive, which is already on the county map as popping thru to Harrisburg Pike....if you put those 8 units per acre on that site, he can't imagine that this group here would say that it's ok to have a huge big operation in there at that density without exits and access to major arteries, this would make Wilson Drive a collector route, which would further damage the area.

Mr. Ross stated that the PA code says that, before adoption of this plan, that Manheim Township must hold at least one public meeting, which is now being held, however, the law does not limit the Township from having more than one such meeting, which hopefully you are planning that, and it does not prevent the Township from having a longer period of public comment, longer than the 5 minutes per speaker that was articulated tonight, to allow for public debate. As the consultants stated, there was a survey and there were 4 listening sessions held in Manheim Township with 100 people in attendance. He doesn't recall a question that asked township residents if they thought that rezoning existing single family neighborhoods to multiple family and high density regions was appropriate.

Mr. Ross stated that the pilot plans seem well defined and articulated and they make sense for new areas.

Mr. Ross stated that, after speaking with a number of the School Lane Hills residents, all of them thought that rezoning this area to a higher density area was inappropriate and there was a general feeling that the process might be going a little faster than they thought it should go, a general feeling of a suspicion, that the map as defined this evening is going to be the map that is presented to the Commissioners for a vote and it doesn't sound like there is opportunity for actual change, just opportunity to comment,

this is another reason why I would like to request that you would take a look at extending the period for public debate, not just comment.

Mr. Ross stated that he would also ask the Township to consider taking a look at talking to the neighboring Townships, because he believes that the Lancaster Township residents would have a lot to say about rezoning that area to high density housing.

2. Patron; Mr. John Hershey, 1005 Pleasure Road Resident

Mr. Hershey indicated that he is a resident of Grandview Heights.

Mr. Hershey stated that he is pro-density, pro-mixed use development and is glad to hear that the Township is considering going up rather than going out, because he thinks that we do have good models for tall residential structures within the community.

Mr. Hershey stated that the green design initiatives and the cultural resources, he thinks its great that the Township should consider green structures, but you could have a platinum rated green structure that's built where it can't be accessed other than an automobile and it could replace an existing structure that could've been adaptively reused, but instead was demolished and thrown into a landfill. So, he would like the Township to expand Cultural Resources from just looking at Agricultural landscapes, which are very important, but also looking at some of our built structures that created distinctive communities, because we are losing those structures at an alarming rate in this Township.

Mr. Hershey said he's glad to hear that a master plan is being promoted for villages such as Neffsville, which is long overdue and asked that the Township please consider expanding the Cultural Resources to include Historical landmarks that helped make Manheim Township a distinctive place.

3. Patron; Mr. Richard Brenton, 1305 Clayton Road Resident

Mr. Brenton stated that as he was looking through the April minutes, in regards to TDRs, according to those minutes, a lot of residents did not support the 7.0 unit density and in fact, a lot came back at 5.0 unit density, so why is the number now 7.0?

Mr. Brenton stated that maintaining the Village Communities such as Neffsville and School Lane Hills was brought up, yet you are proposing changing the style of the residents in School Lane Hills, which are contradictory statements.

Mr. Brenton stated that if we talk about changing the infrastructure within the community and we are going to make changes to roads, that right there is going to change the complexion of the neighborhoods that are directly adjacent to those roads, those are going to be the ones that because of the changing character of that neighborhood are going to affect whether people stay there or don't stay there.

Mr. Geisenberger spoke but was inaudible.

4. Patron; Mr. Tom Sponagle, Hillcrest Road Resident

Mr. Sponagle stated that the School Lane Hills development is under such pressure right now, with the Crossings project and the Railroad project, and now there's discussion about rezoning our area to high density and he's not sure what the theory is on that and why you would want to destroy our neighborhood of School Lane Hills so you can have more density in the Baker Field campus which is owned by F&M. He would ask that the Township reconsider this plan with regards to the affect on School Lane Hills and to please protect it.

5. Patron; Mr. Ray Birdner, 1417 Clayton Road Resident

Mr. Birdner asked if, once the baker field is converted to high density zoning, someone wants to build Section 8 housing or a mobile home park, is that an automatic in that zoning or would they have to go through another step to get something like that approved.

Mr. Staub indicated that future land use designations do not always end up the way the Comprehensive Plan suggests, as with the previous plan, although there were designations, there are numerous areas that never came to fruition.

Mr. Molchany indicated that currently there is a Mobile Home Park Ordinance in place that has specific requirements such as minimum lot areas, etc. which would make it likely that you will not see any mobile homes. Mr. Molchany indicated that Section 8 housing is not controlled by zoning and reiterated that the future land use map is a policy document and does not rezone land....therefore, just because it's being shown on the map as Medium to High Density, does not rezone the land.

Mr. Sturla added that the adoption of this comprehensive plan does not change the zoning, so the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan does not make the future land use map the new zoning map and that each one of those areas would have to go through rezoning which would come up under a different set of circumstances.

6. Patron; Ms. Henrietta Heisler, 1417 Clayton Road Resident

Mrs. Heisler stated that she would like to know what kind of checks and balances we are going to have to ensure if things do progress, that we have beautiful communities. She doesn't mind development as long as it's well done. So, what kind of assurance will we have or architectural review will we have in place so that if we do move forward we achieve great looking projects.

Mr. Staub responded by indicating that there are recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan as to possible checks and balances, but that this is the checks and balances and as indicated, the changes to the Zoning Ordinance could take 3-4 years to come into existence.

Mrs. Heisler asked how the process works....when a developer has a plan, will they come to the residents and the Township and we say yes or no to their plan?

Mr. Sturla responded by advising that plans come before the Planning Commission and that the Comprehensive Plan is not suggesting an architectural review board. Anything that happens at this point has to come back in front of the Planning Commission and everyone is welcome to come and comment on what it looks like and provide your opinions which would be taken into consideration. After the Planning Commission, the plans would then move it forward to the Commissioners for a final vote of approval or denial.

Mrs. Heisler suggested that the community needs to keep the standards really high.

7. Patron; Ms. Edith May, Wilson Drive Resident

Ms. May questioned the impact on roads within historic development and stated that she can see a plan evolving which she would support, especially if there is attention given to land use, density, etc. and that somewhere along the way, and she can see something good happening to Baker Field, but that she's also aware that if there are houses in there, the people that live there will have to get out other than on Harrisburg Pike, in which case Wilson Drive will be affected and probably....

NOTE: Tapes stopped during Ms. May's comments and were replaced.

8. Patron; Mr. Mike Mast, 1417 Newton Road Resident

Mr. Mast asked, with going to R-3 zoning, why was that little swath with Clayton Road and the north side of Newton included in that designation and not just Baker Field?

Mr. Murry responded but was inaudible.

9. Patron; Mr. Stephen Lockey, 529 Hamilton Road Resident

Mr. Lockey asked if all of the zoning south of Route 30 is Zoned R-3, why has that little strip been changed...it doesn't make sense to change that.

10. Patron; Ms. Daralice Boles, 1325 Newton Road Resident

Ms. Boles stated that she understands that this is a policy document but at the same time feels that it is an opportunity to protect the nature of School Lane Hills to hatch out, or hatch differently those two streets to preserve them as part of a broader neighborhood that extends south of our borders, and consider all of School Lane Hills as kind of a historic place in Lancaster. Whatever happens to Baker Field, the neighborhood south of it must be considered and if Wilson Drive does cut through to Harrisburg Pike, that's it for the neighborhood, and then we'll just become another Good Drive. It seems like an opportunity that was missed during this process and there's even another opportunity here potentially which is to think about what other possibilities are there for Baker Field being a wonderful green open space and a part of the city that has very little of that.

No further public comments were received.

Mr. Wolf stated, as we sit here and listen to these new concepts and planning guidelines, we are all trying to struggle with picturing in our minds what these projects may look like, whether they are next to our existing developments or on open vacant farm ground and it's difficult to look into a crystal ball today but one thing we can do to put this into perspective.....About 12 years ago, there was a Planning Commission sitting up here that were presented with a Comprehensive Plan, and they recommended things like detached garages with nanny's quarters above the garages, front porches with rocking chairs, shops that you could walk or bike to from your home, walking trails with lakes, churches and convenience shops within the same development which was put into the existing Comprehensive Plan 12 years ago, and which ultimately became our Planned Residential Development (PRD) Ordinance.

Mr. Wolf stated that in the last 12 years, a few courageous developers have tried three or four of those projects and if you drive through those projects, instead of trying to sit here tonight and read a crystal ball on what these new guidelines may entail, at least we can go back 12 years ago when those types of things were on the horizon and projects were built, like Brighton with alleys, like Kissel Hill Commons where you have a mixed use of duplexes, townhomes, singles, a commercial center, lakes, walking paths.

Mr. Wolf stated that it took some time, but there were developers that took those ideas from the plan 12 years ago and thought it made sense and they tried it.....These PRDs have conditional use requirements such as colors, architecture, street design, landscaping, signage, very detailed policing. So, he thinks that it's important to not lose sight of the big picture and where the Steering Committee is trying to help us go to the next level.

Mr. Wolf stated that he thinks with the allowing the height to go higher and we thinking about more density that the Township doesn't paint a worse case scenario in our minds of subsidized apartment complexes or mobile homes.....he thinks what will actually happen will be a comfortable mixture of those different types of uses and if there is some increased height that may be only on one street that could become a town center with residential above commercial, or we may have some midrise housing that we've never had in Manheim Township with elevator access for the older population that could have one-story living with a balcony.....he just doesn't want the Township to get too far off focus in picturing what these projects will look like.

Mr. Sturla indicated that the planning members will be dedicating a half hour during their regular December 17, 2008 Planning Commission meeting for further Comprehensive Plan discussion.

Mr. Sturla thanked the audience members for attending the meeting and expressing their concerns.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Gibeault, seconded by Mr. Rathman, it was recommended to adjourn the meeting.

Motion approved 7-0 and the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Further discussion of the Comprehensive Plan will take place at the next Regular Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 17, 2008 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon L. Sinopoli